

Rec'd. 27 June 78

Executive Registry

76-11078

OGC

1 ALVIN H. GOLDSTEIN, JR.  
 2 PAUL L. WARNER  
 2 TUCKMAN, GOLDSTEIN & PHILLIPS  
 3 555 California Street, Suite 3180  
 3 San Francisco, California 94104  
 4 Telephone: (415) 956-5400

4 WILLIAM G. HUNDLEY  
 5 PLATO CACHERIS  
 5 HUNDLEY & CACHERIS, P.C.  
 6 1709 New York Ave., N.W., Suite 205  
 Washington, D.C. 20006  
 7 Telephone: (202) 833-3583  
 Of Counsel

8 Attorneys for Defendant  
 9 JOHN N. MITCHELL

10

11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 12 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

13

14 STEPHANIE KIPPERMAN, et al., ) No. C-75-1211-CBR  
 15 Plaintiff, )  
 16 vs. ) SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN SUPPORT  
 17 JOHN McCONE, et al., ) OF MOTION TO DISMISS THIRD  
 18 Defendants. ) AMENDED COMPLAINT OR FOR  
 ) SUMMARY JUDGMENT

19

20 In its memorandum of opinion filed April 28, 1976, the  
 21 Court observed that there was no genuine issue of material fact  
 22 concerning whether plaintiff's mail to the Soviet Union was  
 23 covered or opened during the period 1953 to 1973 [Memorandum  
 24 Opinion, p. 12], and cited United States v. Scrap, 412 U.S. 669,  
 25 688, 689 (1973) which held that "Pleadings must be something  
 26 more than an ingenious academic exercise in the conceivable."  
 27 [Memorandum Opinion, p. 13.]

28 Despite the most recent disclosures of the government,  
 29 plaintiff's complaint remains "an ingenious academic exercise in  
 30 the conceivable." The government's "Report to the Court" filed  
 31 June 7, 1976, offers little solace to the plaintiff since it  
 32 confirms a most critical aspect of this litigation, namely that

Executive Registry File OGC

OGC Has Reviewed

1 plaintiff STEPHANIE KIPPERMAN still does not have information  
 2 upon which she could found a bona fide belief that her mail was  
 3 opened. Although it is possible, according to the government's  
 4 report, that her mail was photographed, there is no record that  
 5 this occurred, unless, of course, the government is withholding  
 6 the facts, an implausible assumption in view of other disclosures  
 7 made by the government with respect to the mail cover program.

8 The astounding fact is that plaintiffs have come this far  
 9 with a complaint that had no basis in fact, vis-a-vis STEPHANIE  
 10 KIPPERMAN, and on the heels of an inquiry under the Freedom of  
 11 Information Act from which the plaintiff, after receiving a  
 12 negative answer, declined to pursue remedies that would have  
 13 allowed her the discovery that she seeks in the instant action.

14 This Court observed in its Memorandum of Opinion that the  
 15 resources of our legal system are limited and that, "Plaintiff  
 16 brought this lawsuit essentially because she was dissatisfied with  
 17 the Central Intelligence Agency's response to her request for  
 18 information from the Agency's files." [Memorandum Opinion, p. 14.  
 19 The Court neglected to mention that plaintiff's remedy in the  
 20 event she was "dissatisfied" was to prosecute an appeal under the  
 21 Act, not to file a spurious action, involving multiple defendants,  
 22 each of whom would have to go to the expense of employing his own  
 23 counsel or rely upon the government to pay that expense. As a  
 24 result, some eighteen separate law firms in addition to the Central  
 25 Intelligence Agency and the Department of Justice are represented  
 26 in this proceedings, and the entire bill is paid by the taxpayers.

27 It does not seem amiss to us under those circumstances for  
 28 this Court to say to the plaintiff, "If you do not have solid  
 29 information upon which to formulate a good faith belief that your  
 30 mail was opened and/or covered by these defendants, then you  
 31 should not be suing them, particularly when the Congress has  
 32 provided the mechanism for you to pursue what you apparently

1 believe is withheld or suppressed by the government without the  
 2 filing of this action."

3 While the government's late discovery is disappointing, it  
 4 is hardly shocking. One does not have to embrace the otherwise  
 5 shocking policies of the government to suggest that what is  
 6 being presented here in its "Report to the Court" merely confirms  
 7 what we already know, namely, that the government engaged in  
 8 illegal activity, but that none of it was directed at STEPHANIE  
 9 KIPPERMAN. One would expect her to be pleased that she was not  
 10 a target of governmental intrusion. Instead, she seems dis-  
 11 appointed, not because she is unable to vindicate a principle,  
 12 but because she does not have the facts upon which to launch her  
 13 action for damages in a situation in which there is absolutely  
 14 no evidence of damage. If indeed STEPHANIE KIPPERMAN is concerned  
 15 about the principle, this will be vindicated in other actions  
 16 involving mail covers that have been filed in other federal courts

17 As the Court noted in its Memorandum of Opinion, page 15,  
 18 plaintiff could have pursued her administrative remedies by appeal-  
 19 ing to the C.I.A.'s Information Review Committee and by doing so  
 20 "substantial savings in time and expense might have been realized."  
 21 While it is perhaps too late to unring the bell, it is not too late  
 22 to call a halt to a lawsuit that is insupportable in fact or in  
 23 law, particularly in a situation wherein another federal statute  
 24 provides a device for further discovery should plaintiff believe  
 25 that she can uncover facts that would support a complaint against  
 26 the defendants herein.

27 For the reasons set forth above, the Dismissal entered by  
 28 the Court should not be set aside.

29 Respectfully submitted,  
 30

31 TUCKMAN, GOLDSTEIN & PHILLIPS  
 32

By ALVIN H. GOLDSTEIN, JR.

TUCKMAN, GOLDSTEIN & PHILLIPS  
 ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
 A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION  
 BANK OF AMERICA CENTER  
 555 CALIFORNIA STREET  
 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94105  
 (415) 956-5400

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL - CCP 1013a, 2015.5

Approved For Release 2004/12/20 : CIA-RDP79M00467A000300130005-0

I declare that: I am (XXXXXX) employed in the county of San Francisco, California.  
(COUNTY WHERE MAILING OCCURRED)

I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within entitled cause; my (business/XXXXXX) address is:

555 California Street, Suite 3180, San Francisco, CA 94104

SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN SUPPORT

On June 24, 1976, I served the attached OF MOTION TO DISMISS THIRD  
AMENDED COMPLAINT OR FOR  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT on the Parties

in said cause, by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the  
United States mail at San Francisco, California addressed as follows:

SEE EXHIBIT "A" ATTACHED HERETO

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed on

June 24, 1976, at San Francisco, California.

(DATE)

(PLACE)

Lisbeth L. Hirschboeck

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

*Lisbeth L. Hirschboeck*

SIGNATURE

ATTORNEYS PRINTING SUPPLY FORM NO. 11  
REV. JANUARY 1973

Irwin Goldbloom  
Civil Division  
Department of Justice  
Washington, D.C. 20530

Jacquelin Swords  
Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft  
One Wall Street  
New York, N.Y. 10005

George Bush  
Central Intelligence Agency  
Washington, D.C.

Marcus S. Topel  
360 Pine Street, Penthouse  
San Francisco, CA

Stanley J. Friedman  
680 Bush Street, #436  
San Francisco, CA

James A. Bruen  
Asst. U.S. Attorney  
16th Floor - U.S. Courthouse  
450 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Paul R. Haerle  
Thelen, Marrin, Johnson & Bridges  
2 Embarcadero Center  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Seymour Glanzer  
Kenneth L. Adams  
2101 L Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037

Charles E. Hanger  
Brobeck, Phleger & Harrison  
111 Sutter Street  
San Francisco, CA

John G. Milano  
Milano & Cimmett  
1545 Russ Bldg.  
235 Montgomery Street  
San Francisco, CA 94104

Richard Ernst  
Ernst & Daniels  
635 Sacramento Street  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Kenneth Adams  
Dickstein, Shapiro & Morin  
2101 L Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037

Martin Quinn  
Pettit, Evers & Martin  
600 Montgomery St.  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Steven M. Kipperman  
Kipperman, Shawn & Keker  
407 Sansome St.  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Charles R. Donnenfeld  
Rodney F. Page  
Cameron M. Blake  
Arent, Fox, Kintner, Plotkin  
& Kahn  
1815 H Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006

Donald J. Cohn  
James B. Kearney  
Webster & Sheffield  
One Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, N.Y. 10002

Plato Cacheris  
Hundley & Cacheris, P.C.  
1709 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006

25X1A

Approved For Release 2004/12/20 : CIA-RDP79M00467A000300130005-0

Approved For Release 2004/12/20 : CIA-RDP79M00467A000300130005-0